The Reformer's Plea for the "Marthas".

I slept;—I awoke;—I was suddenly stirred
Ere the daylight appeared, by the noise that I heard;
The "men-folks" were sleeping all quiet and warm:
"What can be the matter?" I cried in alarm;
I listened—again—ah! I have it at last—
'Tis the housewife preparing for breaking our fast.

Sleep on, Sir Contentment; unconsciously more;
Your wife has been working an hour or more!

We toiled; and we rested, both body and mind;
We examined the "daily" and leisurely dined.
We sat on the porch and we chatted together
Of politics, prices, the crops, and the weather.
But the din of the house had not slackened a bit,
For the house-wife must "do up the work" while we sit.
She must wash, scrub, and brush; she must sew, she must knit,
And have all put aside when the supper's to get.

Sit still, Sir Contentment, beside your porch door,
Your wife is still working as hard as before!

The whistle has sounded, the shop is shut up;
We return to our homes, all eager to sup.
We have worked our "full hours" and we eat with a zest;
Our stomachs are full, and we surely need rest.
But the din of the "housework" again is begun,
For the day of the wife is not marked by the sun;
She must wash up the dishes and clear every corner,
And then do some mending for "little Jack Horner".

Rest; rest, Sir Contentment, as you did before,
Your wife must work yet three hours or more!

Ten hours a day we have worked a fact of late:
We have found that our strength will endure only eight.
But the weary house-wife is far oftener seen
"Putting in double time"—working nearly sixteen.
She is "weakly", and "nervous", she coughs and she sighs:
—Let her share in that rest you well know how to prize.
When you've done your day's work let her sit by your side:
"Who'll get supper?" who'll wash up the dishes?" he cried.

Oh! what shall be done for the weary house-wives?
Those "three meals a day" are the curse of their lives!

—Health Reformer.

Correspondence.

Letters and Extracts.

Br. Geo. W. Miller writes from Millersburg, Minn., January 17:

Br. Himes: We still are surrounded with opposing influences, but the blessed hope gives us courage, and we feel more and more like lifting up our heads, knowing that our redmption draweth nigh. We can fully understand what it is to have a hope that maketh not ashamed. We can also feel the blessedness of having the love of God shed abroad in our hearts while we are looking for, and loving his appearing. It being our Heavenly Father's own arrangement, we love it more and more. Amen!

Yours in hope of eternal life when Christ comes.

Br. A. E. Babcock writes from Jonesville Mich., January 28:

Br. Himes: I have just returned home from Morenci, where I have been laboring for the last thirteen days—but not at the place my meeting was advertised, as the Odd Fellows backed out, and did not let us have their hall, and no other place could be got in the village: but the Lord opened the way for us, and our meeting was held in a district school-house. God was present with his people to buck up his truth with power, and a greater interest to hear is scarcely seen; and it continued until the last backslider was waked up, and sinners converted. Yesterday I baptized four happy ones, and last evening we organized a Church of ten members, with the prospect of its soon being increased to twenty. I think that this community can never go back to their old theories and interpretations of God's Word: for now they see infidels who never before could be led to see that God and the Bible were in harmony, begin to confess that *they* never saw things that way before: To God be all the praise for the light of these last days, which shuts us so clearly that salvation and redemption is near, when all of Father's family will get home, when our trials will be forever ended. Yours in hope.

Our readers cannot fail to be interested in the following letter from Br. Robbins Miller, an old friend, and a son of Father Miller, who writes from Pontiac, Mich., January 16:

Br. Himes: I must say that I have become very much attached to THE VOICE, and could not well make up my mind to do without it. It brings to my mind old associations that are very dear. An Advent paper edited by J. V. Himes! What influence that association may have on the mind would be impossible for me to tell. You will recollect that I was a subscriber to *The Advent Herald* from the first number during the whole time of your connection as an Editor with that paper. After you left it, I still continued to take the paper until I came to Michigan, which will be two years next March. From that time, until you visited us last June, we were without an Advent paper. Since that time we have read with much interest THE VOICE OF THE WEST, and we would say, God grant success to the paper, and may it find ardent advocates and supporters until its warning voice shall be heard by thousands who are now ignorant of the one great truth it teaches: the return of the Nobleman, and by the grace of God be brought to the knowledge of a blissful immortality TO COME, which is the faith I hold. I DO NOT BELIEVE man possesses any immortality here: but that we *seek* for it, and hope for it, and, through the promises of God, believe we will have it when we are crowned with glory, honor, and eternal life.

Br. J. W. Barroughs writes from Warren, Ill., January 21:

Br. Himes: I have been holding meetings a few miles south of this place. Had a good hearing. The people seem anxious to hear the truth in most places. After preaching I gave notice that I had a quantity of tracts for free distribution to those who wish to investigate God's truth. In two places the people came forward *en masse* to receive the little messengers. I distributed them with care to those of whom I believe were anxiously inquiring for truth. May God bless them, and lead them into all truth.

A Baptist brother gave way for me on Sunday evening. My text was, "What is truth?" (Jno. 18: 38.) After showing that God's Word was truth, I endeavored to show them that God had always had a "present truth" before his people. As it was in the days of Noah and Lot, so it is to this generation. The Lord is at hand, as is plainly set forth in God's Word, *which is truth.*

May God help the brethren everywhere to speak boldly, Behold, he cometh!

Br. L. H. Davis writes from LaClair, Ill., January 20:

Dear Brethren: I wish to add my testimony to those of the dear brethren on the side of truth and my blessed Redeemer. The light is shining brighter and brighter, and more and more. The precious Word of God is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path. Almost every day brings out something new to confirm and strengthen the position which we have taken, namely: that we are right upon the threshhold of the great day of the Lord. How important that we should examine our own hearts carefully, to know where we stand; whether our bodies are brought in subjection to the Divine will. We need to study to show ourselves approved of God: then our peace shall flow like a river, and our righteousness be as the waves of the sea. Very soon our work will be done: we shall then have no more opportunity to lead poor sinners to Christ, and ask them to seek salvation through his name. Our influence will be done in that respect. The last opportunity will have been granted them, and it will be forever too late. The door of mercy will have been closed.

Now the fact of our having a form of godliness will not avail us anything in that day: although we may have a correct theory, yet if we have not the power of godliness, or, in other words, if we have not faith that works by love and purifies the heart, it will not avail anything to us. Oh! may the Lord help us each for him or herself to see that our calling and election is made sure. That having done all, we may stand acquitted in that day, is the prayer of one who loves every one of you. I am trying to hold forth the truth, though in great weakness.

Br. Chas. Skinner writes from Springfield, Ill., January 21:

Br. Himes: It affords me great pleasure to say to you that for some time past I have been looking into, and studying over, the Advent doctrine: and I am fully convinced that it is pure Gospel doctrine, and that its teaching is the power of God to the salvation of them that believe. I have been identified with the Baptist Church for more than thirteen years, and have set under its teachings, and have allowed the views of others to be mine without looking into the Word of God, that blessed book. Oh! that men were wise; that they would examine its teachings for themselves! for I find that ministers who are set upon the walls of Zion to proclaim the truth, are liable to err, and be mistaken, and I think sometimes willingly; for if you talk to them about the second coming of our adorable Redeemer, they say, Yes, they believe it, but do not preach it.

It is astonishing how plain and how simple the Word is. I have taken the fifteenth chapter of the first Corinthians, and never has that chapter appeared so precious as it does now. We are commanded to search the Scriptures, and I can truly say, they are my meat day and night. I am determined, by the assisting grace of almighty God, to work out my own salvation with fear and trembling, looking for that blessed hope, and prospect of the appearing of our Savior. Methinks I behold him by an eye of faith coming down from the bright realms above, and saying as he comes, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

I am happy to inform you that we are holding a prayer-meeting at the house of Br. and Sr. Maxey, every Sabbath afternoon. A few of us meet there. May God bless the little prayer-meeting at Father Maxey's. Though but few in number, we are strong in faith. Don't forget us: for we need the prayers of our brethren. That little meeting was the means of bringing me to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. To him I ascribe all praise!

Letter from Br. P. W. Hough.

HEWITT—LEAVITT.—Married, at Mendora, Wis., January 16, 1867, by the subscriber, Br. James Hewitt, of Lewis Valley, to Sr. Ellen F. Leavitt, of Burns.

Br. Himes: This wedding was attended in a full congregation, at a regular meeting of the Church to commemorate the sufferings and return of the Savior. It was indeed pleasant to see the newly married pair walk to the table with the Church to remember the Savior's dying love. At this meeting two were added to the Church, and one arose in the congregation to confess Christ. This was the fourth meeting of this kind ever held by this Church. A brief history may be interesting. It was organized three and a half months ago, with four members. At the first supper it numbered seven; at the next thirteen; at the third twenty-two; at the fourth twenty-seven. The presence of God has always attended its meetings, whether prayer, preaching, or supper occasions. This has been seen and confessed by unbelievers, that God's presence was among them, *because they loved one another.* The silent tear of many in the congregation at this time told the story that they too wished they were Christians. Four confessed this after meeting.

Now what I wish to say is, there must be some cause for this, and that cause applied elsewhere will produce similar effects (all things being equal).

Negatively, it is not because they are not opposed: they are called all the hard names usually cast upon those of this doctrine. They meet with the usual amount of scoffing, and ridicule. No, it is not because they are exempt from this kind of treatment.

But they have been taught, and believed, that each member has a work to do, and all must do their own work, that others may see their good works and glorify the Father. That God will supply to their own duty he will use it. Here lies the secret of their success. There is not a baptized dummy in the Church; and each one, as far as possible, acts as a missionary to all they converse with. They must and will succeed, while they walk by this rule: and let all the saints say, Amen. N. B.—God never loved spasmodic professors, but those who learn how to add to their faith courage, that always abound in the work of the Lord. (1 Cor. 15: 58.) P. W. HOUGH.

West Salem, Wis., January 15.

Selling Out.

Br. Himes: I find many of our Churches West on a decline by members selling out and leaving: and in my adversity, I have posted a notice that I will sell my place where I have been settled for ten years, and thought I would never leave till I went into the kingdom. But I do not want to do as some have done; go in some obscure place where there are no brethren; but propose that we concentrate in some healthy place and form a society, instead of scattering and thus weakening our forces. As I am quite well acquainted with the West, I wish that brethren who wish to move West, or change their location, would write to me, and let me know what kind of a place and business they would like; and if sickly and wishing to gain health, the West has been of great benefit to many. Don't let any one think they are going out of the world. While we have some disadvantages, we have many advantages. If each one will write me in regard to prices, wages, rent, land, &c., I will give the same of the West. While our Churches lose by emigration, they should be made up by the same from other places, for few will embrace the truth now. It is like the gleaning after the harvest. May the Lord direct us to let our light shine, and not put it under a bushel.

PETER S. W. DEYO.

Strawberry Point, Iowa.

[We give the above note from Br. Deyo, and hope that it may aid those who desire information from his section. We are giving information to our friends almost daily, in relation to the West, and Western homes. We hope all our friends will aid in the union and consolidation of the Advent believers in the West; but after all, the hand of God has much to do in our removals and locations: and we must look for his guidance and direction in these things. In very many cases he has planted Advent families in isolated positions, who have let their light shine, and have been the means of raising up Churches. And sometimes one isolated family has done more than many families in other localities. Let the Lord direct us. But let us do all we can for the accommodation of the friends who desire Western homes.—ED.

Holiness.

"Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."

Br. Himes, and all the brethren and sisters who look to the second advent of Christ as their only hope of future life: Are we ready for translation? are our lamps trimmed and burning, and our vessels filled with oil? have we got a "through-ticket" to endless life? can we read our titles *clear*, to a home in the everlasting kingdom of God in Paradise restored? do we realize that none but the pure in heart shall ever see God? are we fully consecrated to his services? is all on the altar, our time, our talents, and our property? If not, we are not prepared.

I sometimes think that some of the brethren do not fully believe the Lord is coming: if they did, they would live more with reference to it. For one, I know *I* have not realized it as I should. Is it possible that soon, oh! very soon, it will be said, "He that is filthy let him be filthy still, and he that is holy let him be holy still." O my God! awaken sensibility in our hearts, and may we go to work for God. Cannot we be the means, in God's hands, of saving *one* soul, one person, to eternally praise his Creator? God help us to look at our duty in the light of eternity, and act in harmony with it: then we shall be saved in the end when Jesus comes. May this be our happy lot is my prayer. PHILO HITCHCOCK.

Exeter, Wis.

The Negro Philosopher.

Upon the hurricane deck of one of our gunboats was an elderly Negro, with a very pilosophical and retrospective cast of countenance, squatted upon his bundle, toasting his shins against the chimney, and apparently plunged into a state of profound meditation. Finding upon inquiring that he belonged to the Ninth Illinois, one of the most gallantly-behaved and heavy-losing regiments at the Fort Donelson battle, and a part of which was aboard, the war correspondent began to interrogate him on the subject.

"Were you in the fight?

"Had a little taste of it, sah."

"Stood your ground, did you?

"No, sah. I runs."

Run at the first fire, did you?

"Yes, sah, and would run sooner had I knowd it was comin."

Why, that wasn't very creditable to your courage.

"Dat isn't my line, sah: cookin's my profeshun."

Well, but have you no regard for your reputation?

"Reputation's nuffin to me by do side of life."

Do you consider your life worth more than *other* people's?

"It's worth more to me, sah."

Then you must value it very highly?

"Yes, sah, I does: more dan all dis wuld, more dan a million of dollars, sah: for what would dat be wuth to a man wid de bref out of him? Self-preservation am de fust law wid me."

But why should you act upon a different law from other men?

"Because different men set different values upon their lives: mine is not in de market."

But if you lost it, you would have the satisfaction of knowing that you died for your country.

"What satisfaction would dat be to me when de power of feelin' was gone?"

Then patriotism and honor are nothing to you?

"Nuffin whatever, sah: I regard dem as among de vanities."

If our soldiers were like you, traitors might have broken up the Government without resistance.

"Yes sah? dar had been no help for it. I would not put my life in de scale ginst any goberment dat ever existed; for no goberment could replace de loss to me."

Do you think any of your company would have missed you, if you had been killed?

"Mabe not, sah: a dead white man aint much to dese sogers, let alone a nigga: but *I'd missed myself*, and dat 'was de pint wid me."—*Sel. by A. Spaulding.*

What Is the Matter?

"We felt it to be our duty to visit Iowa before returning to Michigan. We had not knowledge of the rebellion of Eld. Snook and Brinkerhoff, but we felt that there was a work for us to do in that State. On our way to Pilot Grove, Iowa, we first heard of the rebellion, which was only a few hours before we met its leaders face to face in the meeting-house." (E. G. White, in *Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 12.)

This writer says that they only knew "a few hours before they met the leaders face to face" about the rebellion. This may be so, but we have a few serious things to offer. * * *

We present a letter written to us by Eld. James White, which places the statement made by his wife in rather a peculiar position.

"Monroe, June 13.

"Br. Brinkerhoff: We are pained at the evidences in our hands of Br. Snook's rebellion. See appointment in this week's *Review* for Pilot Grove. I hope there will be a full delegation from all the Church. Be sure and be present. In haste,

"JAMES WHITE."

This was directed to us at Lisbon, Iowa, and dated June 13. Mrs. White met the leaders on the 30th of June at Pilot Grove. Subtract June 13 from June 30 and we find a remainder of SEVENTEEN DAYS. This multiplied by 24 the number of hours in a day gives us FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHT hours. What meaneth all this? Now which is true, Eld. White, or his companion?

Dear reader, do not wonder that we cannot be duped by these things any longer.—*Hope of Israel.*

New Tracts.

The Visions and Theories of the Prophetess Ellen G. White in Conflict with the Bible.

BY WILLIAM SHELDON.

"THE LAW OF GOD."

Texts of Scripture containing the expression, "The law of God," are quoted, with the claim that reference is made to the writing on the tables of stone, in contradistinction to the "law of Moses"—that the ten commandments are the "law of God", which can never be abrogated, while the balance of the law was the "law of Moses", and ended at the cross. The claim that this decalogue is an endless law, and adapted to the future world, as well as this, we have examined, and exposed its fallacy. If only the *ten* commandments were recognized as the "law of God", and if it were true that this law could never be abolished, then it would follow that the seventh-day Sabbath, as an ingredient of this law, would still be obligatory: but upon the other hand, if something beside the ten commandments is included in the "law of God" and that law can never be abrogated, those ceremonial ingredients would also still be obligatory. There is no escape from this conclusion. Then it is a matter of interest to learn what is included in *"the law of God"*, seeing the claim is made that it signifies the decalogue, in which the seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined, and if the "law of God" cannot be abolished, all of its component parts must still be observed, whether Sabbaths, sacrifices, or ceremonies. As we proceed we shall not only learn what is included in the "law of God", but also learn that the same thing which is styled the "law of Moses", is also styled *"the law of God"*. "They spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the BOOK of the 'law of Moses'. * * * So they read in the BOOK of the *'the law of God'*." (Neh. 8: 1–8.)

Here a certain "book" is mentioned, which is not only called the "law of Moses", but is plainly called "THE LAW OF GOD"; and now if "the law of God" can never be abolished, the entire catalogue of requirements contained in this *"book"* are still in force; for there is no evading the fact that it is called "the law of God"; and among other things, "they found written in the law * * * that the children of Israel should dwell in *booths* in the *feast* of the seventh month". This law, which is called *"the law of God"*, speaks of building *"booths"*, and keeping *"feasts"*, none of which things are written on the tables of stone—yet they are to be found in *"the law of God"*, thus proving that something beside the tables, or ten commandments, is recognized as belonging to the "law of God". Furthermore, if "the law of God" can never be abolished, these *"feast"* days, and the building of *"booths"*, with the other ceremonies, are still to be continued, and nothing is left to be nailed to the cross, for the entire "law of Moses" is called *"the law of God"*, as we have proved, just as really as the ten commandments.

In 2 Chronicles 31: 3 we read concerning "the morning and evening *burnt offerings*, and *burnt offerings* for the Sabbaths, and for the *new moons*, and for *set feasts* as it is *written in the law of the Lord*". Nothing can be found on the tables of stone concerning the *"burnt offerings"*, *"new moons"*, or *"set feasts"*, yet it is all *written in "the law of the Lord"*, which proves that something is included in "the law of God" aside from the ten commandments. Moreover, if the "law of God" could not have ended at the cross, and been succeeded by a new law, these "burnt offerings", and "new moons", and "set feasts" are still to be adhered to.

Not only is the book of the law indiscriminately called the "law of Moses" and "the law of God", but the tables of the law are just as really called the "law of Moses" as the "law of God". "Remember ye the *law of Moses* my servant, which I commanded him in HOREB for all Israel, with the *statutes* and *judgments*." (Mal. 4: 4.) Here the law which God made in "Horeb" is plainly called the *"law of Moses"*. What law did God give in "Horeb"? "The day thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in HOREB * * * he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone. And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you *statutes* and *judgments*." (Deut. 4: 10, 12, 13.)

Here we have the law brought to view which was given in "HOREB", and also the *"statutes and judgments"*. Here are two things mentioned—first, the law given in "Horeb", secondly, the "statutes and judgments", which include all the ceremonial features of the law. This law given in Horeb, and written on the "tables of stone" is called the *"law of Moses"*. No *other* law was ever given in Horeb aside from the decalogue, and the *"statutes and judgments"*, which are also often styled the "law of Moses", but are not here referred to under that name, as they are distinctly mentioned in contradistinction to that which is here called "the law of Moses"—with the statutes and judgments". So there is no evading the fact that the decalogue is styled the "law of Moses". This destroys the claim of two distinct laws, one styled the "law of Moses", and ending at the cross; the other styled the "law of God", and continuing in force—for we have seen that the book of the law, and the tables of the law, are indiscriminately styled the law of God, and the law of Moses—being simply different departments of one law, which has been succeeded by a new law.

"THE LAW."

This phrase is played with amusingly by the advocates of the two-law system. Quote to them the statement that we are "not under *the law*", and that is disposed of by saying that reference is made to the ceremonial law; quote another statement containing the phrase *"the law"*, and it is applied to the moral law. Thus *"the law"* is sometimes made to mean one thing, and sometimes to mean another, just according to the necessities of an unscriptural theory. But the Scriptures apply the phrase *the law* to both departments—the moral and ceremonial—one law; and inspired men, in quoting from *the law*, quote from the book and the tables in the same breath. Paul refers to *"the law"* in this manner: "He that loveth another hath fulfilled THE LAW. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. * * * therefore love is the fulfilling of 'THE LAW'." (Rom. 13: 8–10.) Here Paul in quoting from THE LAW quotes from both the tables and the book—thus establishing the fact that they both belong to *"the law"*, and destroying the idea of two distinct laws. * *"The law"* says, "Thou shalt not kill, * * * Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "THE LAW", as far as founded on a prohibition of moral evil, although it had served its time out at the cross, is sanctioned as being in harmony with the Gospel, and thus enjoined in this dispensation, being so far pronounced "holy", "just", "good", and "spiritual": but those appendages pertaining to the observance of days, are not enjoined in the new arrangement. This is true both of the tables of the law, and the book of the law. The advocates of the seventh-day theory deride the idea of having a law end, and after that incorporating a part of it into a new arrangement, and think it absurd. But they find themselves involved in precisely the same dilemma, if indeed it is a dilemma. Let me fairly state their position:

1. They claim *two* laws in the Mosaic age.

2. They claim that the law of God was written on the tables of stone.

3. They claim that the law of Moses was written in a book.

4. They claim that the law of Moses ended at the cross.

Now Christ affirms that *"the great commandment in the law"* is this, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. * * * And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. 22: 36–39.) Now here are two "commandments in the law", and all admit they are *now* ingredients of the law of Christ"; but they never belonged to the decalogue, and consequently, if there are but two laws, they belonged to the law that ended at the cross. When we are inquired of, Why do away with nine good commandments, to get rid of one bad one, and then enjoin the nine again? We inquire, Why do away with the whole Mosaic law, which contained "the great commandments", and then enforce the nine great commandments again? Thus they are caught in their own trap. According to their own claim the Mosaic law ended at the cross: yet these "commandments" were in it. To dodge this point it is said, The *spirit* of these commandments was on the table of stone. This dodge cannot be allowed, for when the lawyer inquired, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus replied, "What is WRITTEN *in the law?* How READEST thou? And he answering, said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, * * * and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered *right*." (Lk. 10: 25–28.) Mark! these commandments were *"written in the law"*, and could be *read*. They were never on the tables, but were recorded in Deuteronomy 6: 5, and Leviticus 19: 18. Beside all this, I deny that even the spirit of these commandments was ever on the tables of stone. A man may not love God with all the heart, and still omit to make idol gods, omit serving them, omit swearing, omit Sabbath breaking, omit to dishonor father or mother, omit stealing, omit committing adultery, omit coveting either his neighbor's wife or property, still not have a particle of love to God in his heart, being simply a moralist. Many moral Universalists may lay claim to all this. A man may neither make or worship images, nor swear, steal, lie, murder, nor covet his neighbor's wife or property, and still not love his neighbor as he does himself. A man might keep the decalogue strictly without the spirit of these "great commandments", which are *"written in the law"* that ended at the cross, and are now ingredients of the Gospel scheme, though the law to which they once belonged is now extinct. So with a part of the decalogue. The Gospel contains principles that once belonged to both departments of the law. The entire old law arrangement has been succeeded by the "law of Christ", which embodies some of the principles of the former law, but never embodied the seventh-day Sabbath enjoinment.

"THE SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN."

"Yes: but when, and for what length of time? Am I told that it was enjoined upon man at the creation? I deny it. There is not a word of the kind in the account. It is a mere statement concerning what God performed on six successive days, followed with the statement that he "rested on the seventh day", and sanctified it; because that in it he had "rested"; but not even an intimation was *then* given that he required man to rest every seventh day: indeed, man had not then fallen, and was enjoying Paradise, and did not stand in need of a day of rest. But Nehemiah tells us precisely *when* God made the Sabbath known to man: "And MADEST KNOWN unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandest them precepts, statutes, and laws *by the hand of Moses.*" (ch. 9: 14.) Hence, the Sabbath was unknown to them till the time of Moses. In fact, the word, the Sabbath is mentioned for the first time in the Bible, and there Moses makes known the Sabbath.

As they gathered manna day after day, Moses is instructed to inform the people to gather two days' rations on the sixth day, from the fact that God had planned that the next day should be a Sabbath-day, or rest-day, and consequently it should not then be found. Nevertheless, some ventured out on the seventh day to look for manna, when the following instruction was given: "See for that the Lord hath GIVEN you the SABBATH, THEREFORE he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." (v. 29.)

Not only is the Sabbath here introduced as a new arrangement, which the people were not yet familiar with, but the connection shows us that seven days preceding this first Sabbath mentioned in the Bible, that the day was not observed as a Sabbath, but was disregarded by Divine sanction. We read: "They took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came unto the *wilderness of Sin* * * on the *fifteenth day* of the second month" (v. 1); and being pressed with hunger, "the whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness", saying, "Ye have brought us forth into this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger." (v. 2, 3.) "Then said the Lord unto Moses, I will rain bread from heaven for you. * * * At even ye shall eat flesh [quails], *and in the morning* ye shall be filled with bread." (v. 4, 12.)

Thus "IN THE MORNING" after reaching the wilderness in a half-starving condition, God gave them manna; that is, they reached the wilderness on the *fifteenth of the month*, and manna fell on the *sixteenth*, and fell six days, then the next day was proclaimed a *Sabbath*, so that Sabbath fell on the twenty-second of the month, and therefore the seventh day before could not have been observed as a Sabbath, for the whole camp of Israel were then journeying. This is made plain by the following diagram:

DAYS OF THE WEEK.		DAYS OF THE MONTH.
Saturday,	15	Israel journeyed to the wilderness of Sin.
Sunday,	16	First day of manna.
Monday,	17	Second day of manna.
Tuesday,	18	Third day of manna.
Wednesday,	19	Fourth day of manna.
Thursday,	20	Fifth day of manna.
Friday,	21	Sixth day of manna.
Saturday,	22	SABBATH.

Thus it is seen that the day on which the children of Israel journeyed to the wilderness of Sin would have been a Sabbath-day, *provided* the Sabbath had then been in force: and the fact that they *journeyed* on that day, instead of resting, is proof that they were not Sabbath keepers prior to the time God "*made known*" the Sabbath by Moses. This observance of the Sabbath was limited to their generations, and was given only for that length of time: "The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath *throughout their generations*, for a perpetual covenant" (Ex. 31: 16), and the *same* is said of the passover, circumcision, the Mosaic priesthood, the blowing of trumpets, the burning of incense, and the offering of sacrifices: and the same argument that would bring the Sabbath into this age, would also bring all these obsolete appendages of the Levitical arrangement into the Gospel economy. If these ceremonies were limited to the *"generations"* of the Jews, so was the Sabbath. Thus we plainly discover *when* the Sabbath was made for man, and *how long* it was to be in force.

But I am told that the term *"man"* is here used in a general sense, equivalent to saying it was made for *men*, thinking thus to make it obligatory on Gentiles. True the term is here used in a general sense, indicating a *plurality* of men, and so it is in Psalms 78: 25: "Man did eat angel's food;" that is, *men* ate it: but does it therefore follow that *Gentiles* must have eaten it? Or that it is to be used in a general sense without including Gentiles?

WOMEN "RESTED ON THE SABBATH-DAY" AFTER THE CRUCIFIXION.

This is simply a record of what transpired, or a history of their doings, without sanction, or comment. It is not at all probable that they were aware that a new dispensation had then dawned, for even Peter was still unenlightened on the question of Christ's resurrection, "for as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead" (John 20: 9); and if Peter was thus in the dark three days after the crucifixion, is it strange that these women still thought they were under the Mosaic law? One must be hard pressed to resort to such arguments. Peter was a long time in getting far enough from the old Jewish law to even *preach* to Gentiles: and these women had not then got the full light.

"PRAY YE THAT YOUR FLIGHT BE NOT IN THE WINTER, NEITHER ON THE SABBATH."

This was spoken with reference to the then approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and no more intimates that their flight on that day would be *sinful*, than that it would be sinful to flee in the *winter*. The Savior well knew that the Jews would still be clinging to the law of Moses, and would stone any man who might venture to make his escape on the Sabbath; therefore, it would be *dangerous* to attempt a flight on the Sabbath, as well as in the inclement weather of winter.

PAUL PREACHED ON THE SABBATH.

So he did on other days. Did he therefore keep other days as Sabbaths? Paul did many things on the principle of availability, aside from preaching on the Sabbath, when he could get the ears of the people to the best advantage: he *circumcised* (Acts 16: 3); he kept *feast* days (Acts 18: 21); he purified himself and others, and had offerings made for them, according to the obsolete law of Moses (Acts 21: 26); all this was done upon the principle of availability, that he might the better gain access to those who were wedded to the law of Moses, and give them the light upon these minor points after he had convinced them of the correctness of the Gospel plan: and, certainly, if he could do all this, to gain the desired end, he would not omit preaching on the seventh day, when the people all turned out to meeting.

SABBATH IN THE NEW EARTH.

"And it shall come to pass from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me." (Is. 66: 23.)

If this text carries the observance of Sabbaths into the new earth, it also carries the observance of new moons there; and certainly that is carrying the *"shadow"* into the sunshine. But I am told this clause simply means from month to month. Then the other merely signifies from week to week. So this dodge is fatal to the seventh-day theory. They do not wish the text to teach the observance of new moons in the future world, and in attempting to escape this, they destroy their own theory. From month to month, and from week to week instead of new moon observance, and Sabbath keeping, is the evident meaning of the text. Just think of carrying the fourth commandment into the world to come: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou *labor* [in the new earth], and do all thy *work* [in the new earth]: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou *shalt not do any work* [in the new earth], thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy MAN SERVANT [in the new earth] nor thy MAID SERVANT [in the new earth], nor thy CATTLE [in the new earth], nor the STRANGER that is within thy gates." Will the saints have *men servants* and *maid servants* in the world to come, either *hired* servants or *bond* servants? Will one class be poorer than another class, and have to hire out in the kingdom? And will God need to keep a standing prohibition against working them on the Sabbath-day? And will the poor *"cattle"* have to "work", too, in the new earth? And are there to be "strangers" there?

THE TREE OF LIFE.

Ellen claims to have seen in vision that the object for which "all flesh shall come up" from "one new moon to another" will be to eat of the tree of life; and, also, that "in order for man to possess an *endless life*, he must continue to eat of the fruit of the tree of life. Deprived of that tree his life would gradually *wear out*". (Gifts, vol. 3, p. 64.) She also says:

"On one side of the river was a trunk of a tree, and a trunk of a tree on the other side of the river, *both of pure, transparent gold.* At first I thought I saw two trees. I looked again and saw they were united at the top in one tree." (Experience, p. 13.)

If her visions are true, they establish the following facts:

1. The resurrected saints must frequently eat of the tree of life to keep from *dying*; even if Jesus did say "neither *can they die* any more". (Lk. 20: 36.)

2. They are all to eat of the fruit *every month*. How many bushels it would take to give them a *monthly* taste remains to be seen.

3. This fruit all grows on *one* tree, which is a *gold tree*, and a *crooked* tree, too, with two ends in the ground, and the trunk arching the river.

Let us look at the quantity of fruit it must bear *monthly*, for "ALL TRUE" are to partake of it once a month, if her vision is true. Here are 144,000 in one company, beside "a great multitude". Let the great multitude be left out of the estimate for the time being, and let us consider that one single tree yielding fruit monthly for 144,000 people. Suppose we could make *one bushel* of the fruit feed *one thousand people*, which would give them less than an apple apiece, (if the tree produced merely little stinted fruit,) even then this one tree would have to yield 144 bushels monthly, and then the great multitude would not get a taste. But if we let in the entire redeemed throng, and scrimp them to one bushel a thousand each month, the tree must bear *millions of bushels of fruit a month.*

That millions of saints are to be supplied with food from a single tree, either monthly, or at more remote periods, is not probable; and the Revelator's statement, "On either side of the river was there the tree of life," doubtless refers to the *species of tree*; as for instance, in describing a forest of trees, it is proper, and Scriptural, to speak of "the pine tree, the box, and the myrtle tree", to indicate the *kind*, and not the *number*. In *Paradise* PERFECTED we shall not be limited to one tree of this kind, but they will grow on both sides of the river, up and down the stream: and the saints will have free access to the delicious fruit, without stopping to divide a bushel among a thousand, or a million of people; and without making *one* tree bear millions of bushels at a time, each month. Nor need we tax our faith to believe that gold will be developed into a fruit-bearing tree, contrary to all past indications of nature.

COVENANT TO 1,000 GENERATIONS.

The most *shameful perversion* of Scripture I have ever met with, is the claim that the covenant embodying the seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined upon a thousand generations, and therefore must reach through this age into the new earth. We have only to read the texts referred to, with their contexts, to see the base imposition, for it is entitled to no milder name:

"He hath remembered his *covenant* forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, which *covenant* he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law; and to Israel for an everlasting covenant: saying, *Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan.*" (Ps. 105: 8–11.)

"That became the Lord loved you, and because he would *keep the oath* which he had *sworn unto your fathers*, * * * hath therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, *the faithful God*, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love his and keep his commandments to a thousand generations: * * * wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments and keep and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the *covenant and mercy which he sware unto thy fathers.*" (Deut. 7: 8–12.)

"Be mindful always of his *covenant*; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham. * * * saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." (1 Chron. 16: 15–18.)

The covenant here referred to is one that was made with their *"fathers"*, while it is said of the covenant that contained the Sabbath commandment, "The Lord *made not this covenant* WITH OUR FATHERS, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." (Deut. 5: 3.) Only the covenant made with their "fathers", instead of the one that contained the Sabbath commandment, is referred to. Who can be blind enough not to see this? *That* covenant will hold good to a thousand generations; and in order to share in its realization, it became necessary to obey God, or to walk in the path marked out under the law, while the law was in force: and it is now needful to walk in the path marked out under the Gospel.

Having noticed some of the main arguments resorted to to bring the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath into the Gospel age, and having discovered their special weakness, we are prepared to prove that the sunshine of the Gospel renders the pale light of the law as needless as moonshine at midday. When the sun rises the mission of the moon is superceded. But our reasons for ending the seventh day, and observing the Lord's day (our Sunday), we reserve for another week.

May God bless the reader in this world, and in the world to come.